Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and remarks in response to the Office Action mailed August 11, 2008. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 18 and 24 are pending. In particular, Applicants amend claims 1 – 18 and 24. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) –** *Brown***,** *Barlow***, and** *Wagner*

    A. **Claim 1 is Allowable Over** *Brown* **in view of** *Barlow* **further in view of** *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

> A method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device, comprising:
> rendering source code that defines the data input screen in the client device;
> defining an executable script within the source code; and
> executing the executable script in response to user input,
> wherein the executable script operates within the client device to render the data input screen inaccessible during processing of the user input to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, **wherein upon completion of processing of the user input, the executable script renders the data input screen accessible**;
> wherein executing further comprises:
> associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that *Brown*, *Barlow*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device… wherein the executable script operates within the client device to render the data input screen inaccessible during processing of the user input to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, ***wherein upon completion of processing of the user input, the executable script renders the data input screen accessible***" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action admits that "*Brown* fails to specifically disclose rendering the data input screen inaccessible to prevent user input" (OA page 3, paragraph 3).

Additionally, *Barlow* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Barlow* discloses an "object designer [that] can selectively lock the Web link behavior 224 so that an end user cannot modify it but could allow the end use[r] to modify an unlocked object 18 if the end user is running the object maker on her local computer" (column 25, line 6). As illustrated in this passage and elsewhere, *Barlow* appears to disclose a locking mechanism to permanently lock end users from modifying a software application. This is completely different than a "method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device… wherein the executable script operates within the client device to render the data input screen inaccessible during processing of the user input to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, ***wherein upon completion of processing of the user input, the executable script renders the data input screen accessible***" as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Barlow*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a "program which may execute in the application space with a browser or overload part of the communication socket program to detect and delete cookie data from HTTP headers" (column 15, line 32). *Wagner*, however, fails to suggest a "method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device… wherein the executable script operates within the client device to render the data input screen inaccessible during processing of the user input to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, **wherein upon completion of processing of the user input, the executable script renders the data input screen accessible**" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

B. **Claim 5 is Allowable Over *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner***

The Office Action indicates that claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 5. More specifically, claim 5 recites:

> An apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device, comprising:
> a central processing unit;
> a memory:
> a user input device;
> a display; and
> a browser adapted to render the input screen on the display,
> wherein source code is provided to the browser that contains instructions that are interpreted by the browser to render the input screen inaccessible after an executable script contained within source code is executed on the client device to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent

user input, ***wherein the input screen is rendered accessible after execution of the executable script***,

wherein the source code further contains instructions which operate to:

generate association of the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and

render inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that *Brown*, *Barlow*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest an "apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device… wherein source code is provided to the browser that contains instructions that are interpreted by the browser to render the input screen inaccessible after an executable script contained within source code is executed on the client device to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, ***wherein the input screen is rendered accessible after execution of the executable script***" as recited in claim 5, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action admits that "*Brown* fails to specifically disclose rendering the data input screen inaccessible to prevent user input" (OA page 3, paragraph 3).

Additionally, *Barlow* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Barlow* discloses an "object designer [that] can selectively lock the Web link behavior 224 so that an end user cannot modify it but could allow the end use[r] to modify an unlocked object 18 if the end user is running the object maker on her local computer" (column 25, line 6). As illustrated in this passage and elsewhere, *Barlow* appears to disclose a locking mechanism to permanently lock end users from modifying a software application. This is completely different than an "apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device… wherein source code is provided to the browser that contains instructions that are interpreted by the browser to render the input screen inaccessible after an executable

script contained within source code is executed on the client device to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, *wherein the input screen is rendered accessible after execution of the executable script*" as recited in claim 5, as amended.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Barlow*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a "program which may execute in the application space with a browser or overload part of the communication socket program to detect and delete cookie data from HTTP headers" (column 15, line 32). *Wagner*, however, fails to suggest an "apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device… wherein source code is provided to the browser that contains instructions that are interpreted by the browser to render the input screen inaccessible after an executable script contained within source code is executed on the client device to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, *wherein the input screen is rendered accessible after execution of the executable script*" as recited in claim 5, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 5, as amended, is allowable.

C. Claim 10 is Allowable Over *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 10. More specifically, claim 10 recites:

> A computer-readable medium having computer-executable components comprising:
> a form definition component defining a data input screen and a data submission field;

a style definition component defining a layer having a width and height at least as large as the data submission field;

a function definition component responsive to the data submission field, wherein upon execution of the function definition component, the layer operates to render the data submission field inaccessible on the form during execution of the function definition component, **wherein the data submission field is rendered accessible upon completion of execution of the function definition component**,

wherein the computer-executable components are operable to perform the following:

associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page, and

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that *Brown*, *Barlow*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a "computer-readable medium having computer-executable components comprising… a function definition component responsive to the data submission field, wherein upon execution of the function definition component, the layer operates to render the data submission field inaccessible on the form during execution of the function definition component, **wherein the data submission field is rendered accessible upon completion of execution of the function definition component**" as recited in claim 10, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action admits that "*Brown* fails to specifically disclose rendering the data input screen inaccessible to prevent user input" (OA page 3, paragraph 3).

Additionally, *Barlow* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Barlow* discloses an "object designer [that] can selectively lock the Web link behavior 224 so that an end user cannot modify it but could allow the end use[r] to modify an unlocked object 18 if the end user is running the object maker on her local computer" (column 25, line 6). As illustrated in this passage and elsewhere, *Barlow* appears to disclose a locking mechanism to permanently lock end users from modifying a software application. This is completely different than a "computer-readable medium having computer-executable components comprising… a

function definition component responsive to the data submission field, wherein upon execution of the function definition component, the layer operates to render the data submission field inaccessible on the form during execution of the function definition component, *wherein the data submission field is rendered accessible upon completion of execution of the function definition component*" as recited in claim 10, as amended.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Barlow*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a "program which may execute in the application space with a browser or overload part of the communication socket program to detect and delete cookie data from HTTP headers" (column 15, line 32). *Wagner*, however, fails to suggest an a "computer-readable medium having computer-executable components comprising… a function definition component responsive to the data submission field, wherein upon execution of the function definition component, the layer operates to render the data submission field inaccessible on the form during execution of the function definition component, *wherein the data submission field is rendered accessible upon completion of execution of the function definition component*" as recited in claim 10, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 10, as amended, is allowable.

D. Claim 15 is Allowable Over *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 15. More specifically, claim 15 recites:

> A method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer, comprising:

receiving a request for an exchange of data from the client computer;

defining an executable script within a source code, the executable script operating in response to a client computer input and rendering a data input screen inaccessible to prevent duplicative processing of a subsequent input from the client computer during the operation of the executable script, *the input screen being rendered accessible in response to completion of the operation of the executable script*; and

providing the source code that defines the data input screen;

wherein defining further comprises:

associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that *Brown*, *Barlow*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer, comprising… defining an executable script within a source code, the executable script operating in response to a client computer input and rendering a data input screen inaccessible to prevent duplicative processing of a subsequent input from the client computer during the operation of the executable script, *the input screen being rendered accessible in response to completion of the operation of the executable script*" as recited in claim 15, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action admits that "*Brown* fails to specifically disclose rendering the data input screen inaccessible to prevent user input" (OA page 3, paragraph 3).

Additionally, *Barlow* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Barlow* discloses an "object designer [that] can selectively lock the Web link behavior 224 so that an end user cannot modify it but could allow the end use[r] to modify an unlocked object 18 if the end user is running the object maker on her local computer" (column 25, line 6). As illustrated in this passage and elsewhere, *Barlow* appears to disclose a locking mechanism to

permanently lock end users from modifying a software application. This is completely different than a "method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer, comprising… defining an executable script within a source code, the executable script operating in response to a client computer input and rendering a data input screen inaccessible to prevent duplicative processing of a subsequent input from the client computer during the operation of the executable script, ***the input screen being rendered accessible in response to completion of the operation of the executable script***" as recited in claim 15, as amended.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Barlow*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a "program which may execute in the application space with a browser or overload part of the communication socket program to detect and delete cookie data from HTTP headers" (column 15, line 32). *Wagner*, however, fails to suggest an a "method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer, comprising… defining an executable script within a source code, the executable script operating in response to a client computer input and rendering a data input screen inaccessible to prevent duplicative processing of a subsequent input from the client computer during the operation of the executable script, ***the input screen being rendered accessible in response to completion of the operation of the executable script***" as recited in claim 15, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 15, as amended, is allowable.

E.   Claim 24 is Allowable Over *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* in

view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements

of claim 24. More specifically, claim 24 recites:

> A method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising:
> associating an executable script with the web page;
> determining if the web page used z-index numbers;
> permitting a first data input to the web page;
> executing, in response to the first data input, the executable script; and
> preventing data entry to at least a portion of the web page after execution of the script to prevent duplicative processing of the first data input and a second data input, wherein preventing further comprises:
> associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for the web page if the web page supports using the z-index number;
> associating the executable script with a division of the web page if the web page does not support using the z-index number;
> rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page by rendering the division of the web page visible over the data entry elements if the web page does not support using the z-index number; and
> rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number if the web page supports using the z-index number,
> ***wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***.
> ***(Emphasis added).***

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24, as amended, is allowable over the cited art

for at least the reason that *Brown*, *Barlow*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, fail to

disclose, teach, or suggest a "method for preventing data entry to a web page… ***wherein upon***

completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the

web page are rendered accessible" as recited in claim 24, as amended. More specifically, the

Office Action admits that "*Brown* fails to specifically disclose rendering the data input screen

inaccessible to prevent user input" (OA page 3, paragraph 3).

Additionally, *Barlow* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically,

Barlow discloses an "object designer [that] can selectively lock the Web link behavior 224 so

that an end user cannot modify it but could allow the end use[r] to modify an unlocked object 18 if the end user is running the object maker on her local computer" (column 25, line 6). As illustrated in this passage and elsewhere, *Barlow* appears to disclose a locking mechanism to permanently lock end users from modifying a software application. This is completely different than a "method for preventing data entry to a web page… ***wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***" as recited in claim 24, as amended.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Barlow*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a "program which may execute in the application space with a browser or overload part of the communication socket program to detect and delete cookie data from HTTP headers" (column 15, line 32). *Wagner*, however, fails to suggest an a "method for preventing data entry to a web page… ***wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***" as recited in claim 24, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 24, as amended, is allowable.

F.   **Claims 2 – 4, 6 –7, 9, 11 – 14, and 16 – 17 are Allowable Over *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner***

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 4, 6 – 7, 9, 11 – 14, and 16 – 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Barlow* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 – 4, 6 – 7, 9, 11 – 14, and 16 – 17. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 4 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 1. Dependent claims 6 –

7 and 9 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 5. Dependent claims 11 – 14 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 10. Dependent claims 16 – 17 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 15. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

II. **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claim 8 is Allowable Over *Moneymaker* further in view of *Wagner***

The Office Action indicates that claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0049708 ("*Moneymaker*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 ("*Wagner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Moneymaker* further in view of *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 18. More specifically, claim 18 recites:

> A method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising:
> associating an executable script with the web page;
> permitting a first data input to the web page;
> executing, in response to the first data input, the executable script; and
> preventing data entry to at least a portion of the web page after execution of the script to prevent duplicative processing of the first data input and a second data input, wherein preventing further comprises:
> associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for the web page; and
> rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number,
> ***wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***.
> ***(Emphasis added).***

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that *Moneymaker* and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method for preventing data entry to a web page… ***wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***" as recited in claim 24, as amended. More specifically, *Moneymaker* discloses "providing a static interface environment which allows items and/or information to be presented to a client/user via a single emanation of a graphical interface environment, such as a 'window' or 'web page'" (page 1, paragraph [0008]). *Moneymaker*, however, fails to suggest that "***upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***" as recited in claim 24, as amended.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Moneymaker*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a "program which may execute in the application space with a browser or overload part of the communication socket program to detect and delete cookie data from HTTP headers" (column 15, line 32). *Wagner*, however, fails to suggest an a "method for preventing data entry to a web page… ***wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible***" as recited in claim 24, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 24, as amended, is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or addressed, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
/afb/
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
 HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway SE
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: **38823**